

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 12 2007

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Shalong Maa, Ph.D.
Application No.: 10/688,269
Filing Date: 10-20-2003
Confirmation No.: 3782
Art Unit: 2174
Examiner: BELOUSOV, ANDREY
Title: "COMPUTER REMOTE CONTROL"

TO: Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Fax: (571) 273-8300

Dear Sir:

APPLICANT'S STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

With respect to the above-captioned patent Application and to the Final Office Action dated 26 April 2007, a Telephone Interview (the "Interview"), initiated by the undersigned *pro se* Applicant (via Phone No. (571) 270-1695), was conducted between the Examiner Andrey Belousov (the "Examiner") and Applicant Shalong Maa. The time of the Interview was 1:30 – 2:10 pm EST (12:30 – 1:10 pm CT) on 11 October 2007. The Interview was pre-scheduled by telephone and emails. The participants of the Interview also included the Primary Examiner Steven Sax in addition to the Examiner and Applicant. Applicant's Statement of Substance of the Interview is as follows:

(A) Exhibit/Demonstration Shown or Conducted

There was no demonstration conducted during the Interview. The ARGUMENTS desired by Applicant to be presented during the Interview were attached to an "Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form" filed 27 Sept. 2007, and were also included in a file "Interview-argument.doc" attached to an email, which was sent to the Examiners in advance. The Examiner had confirmed via email that, the email and the attached files were properly received and opened.

The Interview was essentially conducted following the arguments enlisted in such an email attachment, but Applicant did not have enough time to go over all the arguments therein. The EXHIBIT attached hereto includes a copy of the email communications.

(B) Claims Discussed

The claims discussed during the Interview include the three independent Claims 61, 82 and 88.

(C) Prior Art Discussed

The prior art discussed during the Interview is U.S. Pat. No. 6,353,450 issued to DELEEUW, the primary reference applied in the Final Office Action.

(D) Proposed Amendment

Applicant's latest Amendments to the Claims prior to the Interview were filed on 18 Sept. 2007 in response to the Final Office Action dated 26 April 2007. During the Interview, the Examiners suggested adding the limitation of "**text format data type**" to the claim element "LIVE INFORMATION DATA" of Claims 61 and 82 in order to overcome the foregoing prior art.

(E) General Thrust of Principle Argument

1. By following § 1. of the foregoing proposed Arguments sent to the Examiners in advance, Applicant summarized the Invention of the independent Claims 61 and 82, and reminded the Examiners that, the ref. nos. and paragraph nos. in the original specification and drawings on which each key claim element in Claims 61/82 is based are included/indicated in § 1. of the proposed Arguments.

2. By following § 2. of the proposed Arguments, Applicant summarized the disclosure of DELEEUW, and pointed out that, the objective of and the technical problem desired to be solved in DELEEUW is to employ a real-time video system as user input means for a user to interact with the operating system / application program(s) that are displayed simultaneously with the video (*i.e.*, video-based user interaction, having two layers of display; the additional video layer is made

transparent so as to let the user see and interact with the operating system / application program through the video layer). For example, instead of using a mouse, a user can use a finger/hand within the scene of or captured by a camera/video coupled to the computer system to “click” on a desktop icon. Applicant also summarized the two-layer system in DELEEUEW in realizing such video-based user interaction functionality. The Examiners agreed with Applicant’s such summary.

3. By following § 3. of the proposed Arguments, Applicant summarized the similarity between the Invention of Claims 61/82 and DELEEUEW.

4. By following § 4. of the proposed Arguments, Applicant summarized the differences between the Invention of Claims 61/82 and DELEEUEW, including (i) Data type difference, and (ii) Application program difference.

5. By following § 5. of the proposed Arguments, Applicant provided keyword analysis of the Application program 502/510 in DELEEUEW, and argued that such key analysis clearly indicates that all components/filters of the application program 502/510 in DELEEUEW are provided for processing video data only.

5a. It appeared that the Examiners agreed. But, the Examiners suggested that: (i) the claim limitations in the previously filed Claims 61 and 82 were not sufficient to overcome DELEEUEW (the primary prior art reference applied in the Office Actions), because a broad interpretation of the claim languages of “LIVE INFORMATION DATA RECEIVED FROM A REMOTE COMPUTER ... INCLUDING TEXTUAL DATA ...” could mean that the “LIVE INFORMATION DATA” is of the data types of **both** text data as well as video data that include textual information; thus further limitation is needed to limit the scope of **data type** of the Claims to “text data” (*i.e.*, excluding video data); (ii) accordingly, the claim limitation of “**text format data type**” may be added to overcome DELEEUEW.

6. By following § 7. of the proposed Arguments, Applicant pointed out the key difference between Claim 88 and DELEEUEW. The Examiner stated that he needed more time to go through the relevant portion of DELEEUEW.

(F) **Other Pertinent Matter Discussed**

None. (The telephone communication were interrupted for a few minutes. After the interruption, the sound quality of the communication became worse. But the parties were able to complete the Interview.)

(G) **Outcome of Interview**


The Examiners suggested adding the foregoing claim limitation of "text format data type" to Claims 61 and 82, and agreed that by adding such claim limitation, the primary prior art reference, DELEEUEW, will be overcome as to the independent Claims 61 and 82 (and to those claims depending therefrom). But, more prior art search may be needed.

(H) **Email**

A copy of the email communication relating/prior to the Interview is included in the EXHIBIT attached hereto.

Respectfully Submitted

SIGNED ON: 12 October 2007


BY: Shalong Maa, Ph.D. *Pro Se* Applicant
P.O. Box 600118,
Dallas, TX 75360-0118
sm2k@yahoo.com; (214) 228-8679